

REMARKS

New claims 30-33 are supported by the example structures at pages 13-18, and page 10, lines 14 et seq of the specification. Support for “fully complexed” is found in original claims 6 and 17 and page 8, lines 5-11 of the specification. Claims 9 and 18 have been amended to make it clear that each of the named substituents must have 2-12 carbons (page 9/line 9 and page 10/line 8 of the specification).

It is believed that the present invention is patentably distinguished from the cited art since the claims are limited either to “fully complexed” indoles, to “isoindoles” or to indoles with certain substituents each having 2-12 carbon atoms.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is two paragraphs in length and may only be one paragraph in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claims 6, 9, 15, 17, 18 and 19 stand objected to because of the following informalities: “In claims 6, 9, 15, 17, 18, 19 “Rh.” Should be changed to “Rh,””. The punctuation has been corrected.

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The word “means” has been removed from claim 25.

Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 16-18, 20, 21, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Thompson et al. (US 2003/0017361 A1).

According to the Examiner:

Thompson et al. discloses organic light emitting displays comprising organometallic complexes comprising platinum, iridium, and osmium in the emissive layer (see abstract). The formula of the organometallic complexes is L_2MX (see abstract). The L ligands may include phenylindoles as shown in Figure 49 and described in paragraph 109. There may be 2 “ L ” ligands, which reads upon the requirement of a plurality of indole compounds per claim 6. With regard to claims 9 and 18, the phenylindole ligand of Figure 49 shows two methyl substituent groups, which comprise a total of two carbon atoms. With regard to claim 21, Thompson et al. disclose the emissive organometallic complex is within a host material (see abstract).

Independent claims 6 and 17 limit the complex to ones fully complexed with the indole compounds. Claim 9 is now clearly limited to individual substituents having 2-12 carbon atoms.

Claims 22, 24, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson (US2003/0017361 A1). These claims as well as claim 25 should now be patentable due to the amendments to the independent claims.

According to the Examiner:

Claims 12-14 are allowed. Claims 15 and 19 stand objected to for a minor informality as stated previously in this Office action, but contain allowable subject matter. Claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The foregoing amendments serve to overcome the basis for these objections

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection and to pass the subject application to Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 25,518

Arthur E. Kluegel/dlm
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-2625
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.